



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/563,311

12/30/2005

Eiji Murakami

96790P517

6897

8791

7590

05/19/2008

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN
1279 OAKMEAD PARKWAY
SUNNYVALE, CA 94085-4040

EXAMINER

HWA, SHYUE JIUNN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2163

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/19/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No. 10/563,311	Applicant(s) MURAKAMI ET AL.	
	Examiner JAMES HWA	Art Unit 2163	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 05 May 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 (a) ☒ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
 5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
 6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
 7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☒ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
 The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
 Claim(s) allowed: _____.
 Claim(s) objected to: _____.
 Claim(s) rejected: 1, 3-5, 8-10, 12-14 and 17-18.
 Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
 9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
 12. ☐ Note the attached Information *Disclosure Statement*(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.
 13. ☐ Other: _____.

/Cam Y Truong/
 Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2162

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Amended limitation "term list edition module for adding or deleting an arbitrary term with respect to the term list; and index generation module for making said DT matrix generation module generate DT matrices by using term lists before and after edition by said term list edition module, and generating and outputting an index indicating validity of the edition from the DT matrices." in claims 1 and 10 raise new issue that require further consideration and/or search. .

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argued Agrawal neither teaches nor suggests repeating the large classification outputting in association with new DT matrix generation for each cluster. In response the argument, Agrawal teaches large sub-trees in the topic tree can be eliminated forthwith if the score of the root of those sub-trees are very poor. Text database population is not the only application of fast multi-level classification. With increasing connectivity, it will be inevitable that some searches will go out to remote text servers and retrieve results that must then be classified in real time (page 8, paragraph 0131). The process is repeated for each document in the model validation, such that a function of the error rate versus number of terms is generated for each document (page 10, paragraph 0158). Also, Tokuda teaches the diagonal elements of S are sorted in decreasing order of magnitude. To obtain a new reduced matrix $S_{sub.k}$, the k-by-k leftmost-upper corner matrix of S is kept and other terms are deleted (column 5, lines 21-25). Claims 1 and 10 are a 35 USC103 rejection.

Applicant argued the "index generation module," the idea of generating an index indicating usefulness in association with the DT matrix generation is not taught in any of the cited three references.

In response the argument, Agrawal teaches the hierarchical technique can handle millions of documents and tens of thousands of topics. A resulting taxonomy and path enhanced retrieval system (TAPER) is used to generate context-dependent document indexing terms (abstract).

Applicant argued Tokuda does not teach the component elements featuring the present invention at least in association with the DT matrix. These component elements are not taught by either Glover or Agrawal.

In response the argument, Tokuda teaches to obtain an intra-DLSI space, or an I-DLSI space, a differential term by intra-document matrix where each column of the matrix is constructed where each column of the matrix denotes the difference between the document and the centroid of the cluster to which the document belongs (column 2, line 64 to column 3, line 1). Also, Agrawal teaches singular value decomposition on the term-document matrix has been found to cluster semantically related documents together even if they do not share keywords (page 2, paragraph 0021).

As discussed above, Examiner respectfully maintained the last action as a final rejection.